

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-26 are pending in this application, whereby none of the original claims 1-25 have been amended or canceled, and whereby new claim 26 has been added. Support for new claim 26 may be found, for example, on page 31, lines 19-35 of the specification.

In the Office Action mailed January 15, 2003, claims 1, 3, 7, 9-11, 16-20, and 22-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,572,221 to Marlevi et al. (hereinafter "Marlevi"), and claims 2, 4-6, 8, 12-15 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Marlevi in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,473,609 to Schwartz et al. (hereinafter "Schwartz"). These rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the reasons given below.

The Office Action incorrectly asserts that Marlevi discloses the present invention as recited in claims 1 and 11, at col. 2, lines 59-67, Abstract, col. 4, lines 57 to col. 5, line 2, col. 7, Lines 17-34 and col. 15, lines 20-65.

In these quoted portions, Marlevi describes a scheme for predicting a movement (a next location) of a mobile terminal according to the user's past movement patterns, and then for distributing (pre-connect or pre-assign) data/services of servers at the predicted location. That way, the user can obtain access to data/services at the predicted location with virtually the same efficiency as at the previous location. Here, please note that it is an essential teaching of Marlevi to use the prediction of movement of the mobile terminal.

However, as should be apparent from claims 1 and 11, the present invention does not use any prediction of a movement of the mobile terminal.

In claim 1, the selected WWW information for the mobile computer is cached in one or more cache servers located nearby the mobile computer, which are selected according to a message sent from the mobile computer itself which indicates a connected location of the mobile computer in the wireless network. In this way, it becomes possible for the mobile computer to access the specific

information relevant for the mobile computer from the nearby cache server faster even at a new location which the mobile computer just moved to.

In this regard, Marlevi fails to disclose or suggest anything related to receiving such a message from the mobile computer, and Marlevi fails to disclose or suggest managing the cached contents of the selected cache servers according to such a message. Thus, Marlevi fails to disclose or suggest the management unit that is recited in claim 1.

Also, in claim 11, the selected WWW information for the information provider is cached in one or more cache servers located within a geographic range defined for the information provider. In this way, when the information provider wishes to distribute some specific information only within some specific geographic range, this specific information can be cached in the cache servers within this specific geographic range, such that any mobile computer which moves within this geographic range will access the cached information, which implies that the specific information provided by the information provider is more likely be viewed by the user of the mobile computer which comes into this specific geographic range.

In this regard, Marlevi fails to disclose or suggest anything related to such a caching of information in cache servers located within the geographic range specified by an information provider. Rather, Marlevi is only concerned with providing data to a mobile terminal based on the data utilized by the mobile terminal in locations that the mobile terminal has moved away from (see, for example, col. 15, lines 25-28 of Marlevi), and whereby Marlevi does not disclose or suggest information providers (e.g., a big store in a mall which the mobile computer is currently located very close to) that can provide information to the mobile computer in order to entice the user of the mobile computer to utilize the services of the information provider at the specific location where the mobile computer is currently located.

Therefore, Marlevi fails to disclose or suggest the management unit that is recited in claim 11.

The same argument also applies to the dependent claims 2-10 and 12-15 of claims 1 and 11, as well as method claims 16 and 17 corresponding to claims 1 and 11, management device claims 18 and 19 corresponding to claims 1 and 11, mobile computer claims 20-21 corresponding to claim 1, cache server claims 22 and 23 corresponding to claims 1 and 11, and service providing method claims 24 and 25 corresponding to claims 1 and 11.

Note in particular that Marlevi fails to disclose or suggest any caching service providing method as recited in claim 24, where the specific user is registered as a premier user and the caching service according to a message received from the user as recited in claim 1 is provided to this premier user, or as recited in claim 25, where the specific information provider is registered as a premier sponsor and the caching service according to the geographic range defined for the information provider as recited in claim 11 is provided to this premier sponsor.

In conclusion, since Schwartz does not make up for the above-mentioned deficiencies of Marlevi, the rejections made in the Office Action based on Marlevi (either totally or in part) are incorrect, and all of claims 1-25 are patentably distinct over the prior art of record, so that the present application is already in condition for allowance.

New claim 26 has been added to recite features of a premier sponsor and a non-premier sponsor, whereby the premier sponsor is provided with a greater number of cache servers in which to provide its information to. Such features are not taught or suggested by the cited art of record.

Accordingly, Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

July 9, 2003

Phillip J. Articola  
Phillip J. Articola  
Registration No. 38,819

FOLEY & LARDNER  
Washington Harbour  
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 500  
Washington, D.C. 20007-5143  
Telephone: (202) 672-5300  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399